DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 229 839 EA 015 616

AUTHOR	Loucks, Susan F.
TITLE	Planning for Dissemination. Monograph Number 1.
INSTITUTION	North Carolina Univ., Chapel Hill. Technical Assistance Development System.
SPONS AGENCY	Department of Education, Washington, DC.
PUB DATE	Jan 83
CONTRACT	300-82-0369
NOTE	28p.; The Technical Assistance Development System (TADS) is a program of the Frank Porter Graham Child Development Center.
PUB TYPE	Guides - Non-Classroom Use (055)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Adoption (Ideas); *Demonstration Programs; Diffusion (Communication); Early Childhood Education; *Information Dissemination; Instructional Innovation; *Program Implementation
IDENTIFIERS	Levels of Use of the Innovation

ABSTRACT

This guidebook identifies the tasks in disseminating new programs and provides profiles for judging their progress. The process of presenting a program to new users is divided into seven tasks: creating awareness of the project, establishing commitment among the users, providing materials, training personnel, planning to meet users' individual needs, solving problems, and monitoring and evaluating the progress of the program. The process further involves determining the influence of the program on the users' behaviors, finding the influence on target populations, and evaluating the whole project. Expanding on the task of planning to meet users' needs, the author offers three planning profiles that monitor how well users are accepting innovations introduced by the model program, users putting the new program into practice, and, in a comprehensive practice profile, to what extent and how accurately the intended model program is being used. The last section describes the vision, leadership, commitment, and fidelity to the model that are needed in users in order successfully to adopt model programs. (JW)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED229839

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

Planning for Dissemination

by Susan F. Loucks

EA 015 616

TADS

The U.S. Department of Education (through Special Education Programs' RFP 82-043 and contract award) charged TADS to provide information services to assist HCEEP State Demonstration Grant project colleagues in their work. Topics are to address critical issues and challenges confronted by projects, as well as to focus on proceedings from topical workshops.

Information services are to be provided through the preparation and distribution of four monographs yearly. Ideas for topics and contributors are most welcome from our demonstration project colleagues.

* * *

Principal Investigator: Pascal L. Trohanis
SEP Project Officer: Gary Lambour
Managing Editor: Daniel Assael
Editorial Assistant: Iqlia Grennan
Typist: Terry Rothra

This Monograph (Number 1) was prepared for Demonstration grantees of the Handicapped Children's Early Education Program (HCEEP) administered by Special Education Programs (SEP), U.S. Department of Education. The material also addresses concerns of Outreach grantees and those in other agencies involved in use of model programs.

This paper is published by the federally sponsored Technical Assistance Development System (TADS), a national support system for SEP and HCEEP. TADS is located at 500 NCNB Plaza, Chapel Hill, North Carolina 27514. Our phone number is (919) 962-2001.

This Monograph is distributed pursuant to contract number 300-82-0369 from the U.S. Department of Education. Contractees undertaking such projects under government sponsorship are encouraged to express freely their judgment in professional and technical matters. Points of view and opinions, however, do not necessarily represent Department of Education positions or policy. The enclosed contents are presented for information purposes only; no claim of accuracy is made. Finally, mention of trade names, commercial products, or organizations does not imply endorsement by the U.S. government.

January 1983

The Technical Assistance Development System
A program of the Frank Porter Graham Child Development Center
University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill

Susan F. Loucks is a Program Associate for The NETWORK, Inc., Andover, Massachusetts. She directs education projects in areas of school improvement, research, and technical assistance. She has written extensively about the change process and dissemination.

PLANNING FOR DISSEMINATION

Susan F. Loucks

The NETWORK, Inc.

INTRODUCTION

Model programs that must develop, demonstrate, and disseminate have a difficult mission. The energy involved in development, and sustained through a demonstration effort, can dissipate by the time the project turns to dissemination. Model programs must think clearly about dissemination -- not only during the last months of funding, but throughout; not only as a nod to a funding agency's requirements, but as a conscious effort to extend project impact.

For HCEEP Demonstration projects, dissemination* can mean:

- spread
- facilitating change
- exchange
- implementation

Model programs typically embrace the notion of "spread," developing brochures and awareness sessions and writing articles and manuals. These strategies increase knowledge but rarely change people's skills and behaviors.

"Implementation" describes the ultimate goal of dissemination efforts -- to get a program used in another setting. The view expressed in this monograph is that if a program or its components aren't ultimately used elsewhere, the dissemination effort has failed. Though difficult, the task of helping others to use a new, effective program should be the charge of all model program developers.

This monograph will try to answer this question: What must a model developer know about successful implementation to effectively help others adopt and use a model program? The ideas offered reflect the author's understanding of research on dissemination strategies that actually result in changes in practice.

---

*This elaborate definition of "dissemination" resulted from work by the Dissemination Analysis Group in 1977.

The major source for this paper is a study recently completed by The NETWORK, Inc., at Andover, Massachusetts, called "A Study of Dissemination Efforts Supporting School Improvement" (The NETWORK, Inc., 1982). Other studies which preceded and fed into this one are also used as source material (see reference list). These sources constitute a body of research examining a long line of federally funded demonstration and dissemination programs (including HCEEP) which used such varying strategies as:

** having publishers distribute government-funded, locally developed materials;

** describing a project in great detail, packaging it and distributing it without in-person assistance;

** engaging prospective users in a problem-solving process, selecting a project for adoption and assisting in implementation;

** using a network of developers and state-based facilitators to make potential users aware of a large variety of effective projects they might adopt, training them and supporting implementation.*

This monograph uses results of research on these strategies to organize guidelines for model program dissemination and to answer these questions:

** What must the disseminator do to help others adopt a model program or practice?

** Planning Tools the disseminator and adopter can use to work together to effect a long line of progeny that clearly demonstrate a maximum return on the investment of public monies?

** What must the adopter do to implement a model program or practice?

Some ideas follow.

---

*Examples of these four strategies are U.S. Special Education Program's Market Linkage Program, Product Information Packages, the R&D Utilization Program and the National Diffusion Network. See Bibliography for information about each.

WHAT MUST THE DISSEMINATOR DO?

Effective dissemination is an interactive process. As a model program, you must do certain things, and the adopting organization and individuals also must perform in certain ways to make implementation effective. You can help them perform their roles by helping them conceptualize, plan, and organize the effort. Assign responsibilities and develop timelines in ways you know work best. This is a far cry from sending out materials or giving a one-shot, "goodbye-and-good-luck" workshop. It also is more effective.

This part of the monograph lists and describes some of the assistance roles you must perform. Later in this document these ideas are developed in greater depth as a step-by-step process unfolds. Functions you can effectively perform are presented here.

Create Awareness

Individuals who are just learning about a new project which they might adopt have two primary questions: What is it? and How will it affect me? Awareness materials should address these questions. At this point, there is no need for detail about organization and management, nor about all the various outcomes the users can expect (although some of this, of course, is necessary); these details will come later. Keep awareness materials brief and to-the-point. Create an image of what the project will look like when it is in place (more about this later).

Establish Commitment

Clearly, an external person alone cannot create commitment in adopting parties, but you can affect that commitment. Talk with individuals or small homogeneous groups about their benefits derived from using your project or its components. Take advantage of your image as an outside expert.

Provide Materials

Several years ago, one federal education program (Sterns and Norwood, 1977) found that providing materials alone does not effectively disseminate a program. However, with your help interpreting and explaining them, materials can certainly be important. Materials may be the items actually needed for implementation -- curriculum materials, equipment, recordkeeping cards, etc. -- or they may be instructional manuals -- e.g., "How to Manage," "How to Assess Children's Needs," "How to Teach Developmentally Disabled Children." All materials must be high quality, clear, and comprehensive. Check with an expert in product development.

Train

Secure a commitment from adoption site staff to attend training sessions. Training should include step-by-step procedures for using your project -- teaching and assessment skills for teachers, management skills for managers, etc. Principles of adult learning must come into play here. Provide information, demonstration, hands-on practice, and opportunities to discuss with others and plan for direct application to their own situation.

It is now accepted knowledge (Berman et al., 1975; Hall and Loucks, 1978b; Huberman and Crandall, 1982) that one-shot training is rarely successful. To use a new program, people must try out new behaviors a few at a time and be able to come back periodically to solve problems and learn more. These opportunities can be provided by dividing training into segments of, for example, one or two days a month for three months. Or, a large initial session can be followed by regular individual and small-group consultations over the next several months. These strategies allow time to practice, adjust and add to behaviors with expert guidance. Without follow-up training, behaviors that don't seem to work the first time will be discontinued or changed so radically from what was intended that they may do more harm than good.

Plan

Model program developers offer a welcome perspective to people in potential adoption sites; the developers have a good program and they've used it well. They've seen it work in other, sometimes quite different settings, and they have some ideas about effective implementation in most situations. Yet research (Bauchner et al., 1982) has found that one of the most important kinds of assistance -- which rarely gets delivered, especially by an outsider -- is helping individuals at the given site plan for implementation. Planning includes assessing the adopter's own situation before training and implementation; making necessary adjustments ahead of time so the program fits the setting; and working closely with program staff to rearrange staffing assignments and schedules, reallocate resources and fully understand what needs to happen on a day-to-day basis. Implementation planning extends beyond the training phase so that continual adjustments can be made to help the adopting staff meet the needs of their own situation.

Solve Problems and Troubleshoot

There are many ways to locate and solve problems. Someone from your model program might return periodically (frequently at first) to an adopting site to help users think about problems they are having as they implement your program. Often this can be done simply by visiting and observing and then holding informal voluntary sessions for staff at the adopting site. Staff can describe how things are going, and you can discuss their problems and reinforce what they're doing. Never underestimate the benefits of encouragement -- especially in the first stages of implementation, when users are uncertain about what they're doing and concerned about making things work.

Another and perhaps the most cost-effective way troubleshooting assistance can be delivered is by working closely with a staff person at the adopting site to help that person become an expert and an advocate for your program. This person has the advantage of being readily available to serve as a troubleshooter for other staff at the adopting site, saving you time and the adopting agency money for your travel. This delivery scheme also increases the adopter's internal capability to use and support your program. The value of such a local facilitator is well supported in the research on change (Bauchner et al., 1982; Loucks and Hall, 1979).

Local facilitators can get things done quickly and efficiently; they are accessible and often have resources on hand and some clout or influence to wield. They are particularly effective if they support your program for their site.

Monitor and Evaluate

Like follow-up assistance, monitoring is best done by somebody who has regular and ready access to the adopting site. Thus, as disseminator, you might not do the actual monitoring and evaluation of an adoption effort. Monitoring is essential assistance for any change effort; it helps ensure that the model program is implemented as intended.

Consider how monitoring will be done and who will do it. Monitoring and evaluating activities should be determined with the adoption site program manager.

Reasons to monitor an adoption effort depend on that effort's intended outcomes, so let us digress for a bit to discuss some different outcomes an adopting site might seek. Two major kinds of outcomes may result from an effort to implement a model program (Loucks et al., 1982) -- implementation outcomes (the assessment of which indicates how well the site has adopted your program) and target population outcomes (whose assessment measures the efficacy of the program itself).

Implementation Outcomes. Various implementation outcomes are possible, ranging from those which involve individual users (teachers, health care professionals, day care workers, infant specialists) to those which involve the users' organization.

Individual outcomes refer to the extent to which each user's personal behaviors or attitudes have changed to those needed for the model program. Such outcomes include:

- Change in Practice - How much change has occurred in the user's behavior from before the adoption of the new program to the present?
- Fidelity - How closely does use follow program design and intentions?
- Extent of Implementation - How much of the model program, or how many of its components, is the user employing?

As a new model is integrated into an ongoing program, adopters' skills in using the new behaviors grow, and their attitudes toward the new program change. Thus monitoring these "growth dimensions" is often useful. "Stages of Concern" and "Levels of Use" are two concepts (described later) that can help you assess the extent of this developmental growth of each user of your model program.

Although it is critically important to know what individuals are doing with your model program, organizational change is also essential to an integrated use of the new program and to assurance that the model "sticks." Thus implementation outcomes which may be monitored at the organizational level must also be considered. These outcomes include:

- Organizational Change - What changes have occurred that affect the entire agency (for example, a shift in roles and responsibilities, or new allotments of time and space)?
- Institutionalization - What steps have been taken to ensure that the model program will become an ongoing part of the agency? For example, in assessing these outcomes you might ask: Are new staff trained to use the program? Are all needed materials and equipment routinely ordered and supplied?

Implementation outcomes, both individual and organizational, can help you determine the extent to which the adopting site has implemented your model program.

It is also possible for you to provide adoption sites with tools for monitoring the implementation outcomes, particulary those which occur at the individual user level. (Such tools will be discussed in the next section of this monograph.)

Target Population Outcomes. Outcomes to be found in the target population (for our purposes, the handicapped child and family) may include cognitive learning, developing attitudes, acquiring skills, and developing psychomotor and life skills. The evaluation of such target population outcomes requires the identification and use of appropriate assessment tools that should be part of the package you offer adoption sites.

Relationship to Evaluation. Having looked at the variety of intended outcomes that will affect monitoring and evaluation considerations, we are better equipped to discuss evaluation. Generally, two kinds of evaluation are conducted: formative evaluation is done throughout the course of the program; summative evaluation is conducted at the end of a certain period and asks, "Is this program any good?"

When money is an object -- as it often is -- the summative evaluation is often given priority over the formative. I would argue for the reverse case. A number of research and evaluation studies document the fact that often we end up evaluating "non-events" -- that is, we focus on the outcomes of a program that has not in fact been implemented. This poor focus easily occurs when only target population outcomes have been measured; as mentioned above, it is necessary to examine implementation outcomes if we are to know whether a program has in fact been implemented. Conducting formative evaluations, where implementation outcomes are examined, will help ensure that the program is properly implemented; then a summative evaluation measuring target population outcomes will truly indicate the efficacy of the program.

In addition to clarifying evaluation results, monitoring implementation outcomes provides needed information for those supplying assistance. Knowing the extent to which a program's components are being implemented by individual staff members is a key to knowing what kind of assistance would be most relevant to them. Either the same person should do monitoring and follow-up, or a very close connection should be established between the two roles. Another benefit of monitoring is that individual staff members notice that attention is being given to the new program, a clear message that it is important for them to continue to use program components.

Finally, information gained during a monitoring process is a valuable resource for communicating regularly with a model program's clients or constituencies. A new program rarely achieves early success in target population outcomes, but information gained through monitoring can be used to stimulate continued efforts by keeping informed those people who were supportive (or even skeptical) about the adoption. What kinds of things are happening now that weren't happening before? Are increases in skills and sophistication in using the new program noticeable? How do people feel about using the new program? Being able to provide answers to such questions reminds people that something important is happening, something that ultimately can result in important changes for children.

Summary

In summary, these seven assistance and support tasks are critical to an adopting site's successful implementation of your model program or components) (Loucks et al., 1982):

- ** create awareness
- ** establish commitment
- ** provide materials
- ** train
- ** plan implementation

** solve problems and troubleshoot
** monitor and evaluate

The following section of this monograph describes some tools that can help you perform these tasks.

PLANNING TOOLS

Practices and programs are described in many ways: by the goals they espouse; by the outcomes they achieve; by the facilities, equipment, and training they require. They also can be characterized by approach or underlying philosophy: "diagnostic/prescriptive," "competency-based," "humanistic," "individualized." All these descriptors give us a sense of what the practice is (or is not), but they hardly help us picture the practice in action. They do not help us understand what we might do to implement the practice, nor do they guide us in what to look for in evaluating the practice. We are forced to make leaps of faith that a program is being implemented when people say it is, and we therefore can be of limited help in improving program use.

SOC and LOU

To describe how individuals change as they implement new programs, the Texas Research and Development Center for Teacher Education developed these conceptual frameworks: "Stages of Concern" (SOC) and "Levels of Use" (LOU). Both frameworks consist of specific tools that disseminators can use.

Stages of Concern. When involved with an innovation, individuals generally progress through three global stages in their concerns about the new approach. Concerns about self ("How will this affect me?") manifest during introductory phases. The initial use period is characterized by concerns about program management ("Will I ever get it all organized?"). Only when these concerns are resolved do concerns about impact on learners dominate ("Are they learning what they need to learn?"). Hall and Loucks (1978b) identify seven stages of concern that reflect this general progression (see Figure 1).

Levels of Use. The way people use the new programs also changes. Generally, as individuals become more familiar with a program, they become more skilled and coordinated in its use and more sensitive to its effect on students. Levels of use of the innovation (see Figure 2) is another dimension that describes changes in individuals in relation to their actual use of an innovation (Hall et al., 1975).

As noted earlier, different dissemination and implementation activities are appropriate at different times in the change process. "Stages of Concern" and "Levels of Use" are good tools for judging appropriate dissemination and implementation activities. For example, if people are asking "What is it?" and "How will it affect me?" (Stages 1 and 2), it's useless to deliver a

Figure 1

STAGES OF CONCERN: TYPICA' EXPRESSIONS OF CONCERN
ABOUT THE INNOVATION*

Stages of Concern	Expressions of Concern
(0) Awareness	"I am not concerned about the innovation."
(1) Informational	"I would like to know more about the innovation."
(2) Personal	"How will using the innovation affect me?"
(3) Management	"I seem to be spending all my time getting materials ready."
(4) Consequence	"How is my use affecting kids?"
(5) Collaboration	"I am concerned about relating what I am doing with what other instructors are doing."
(6) Refocusing	"I have some ideas about something that would work even better."

Hall and Loucks, 1978b*

*This publication (see Bibliography for complete citation) explains in detail how to use this tool and how to relate it to "Levels of Use" (Figure 2).

Figure 2

LEVELS OF USE OF THE INNOVATION: TYPICAL BEHAVIORS*

Levels of Use		Behavioral Indices
(0)	Nonuse	No action is being taken with respect to the innovation
(I)	Orientation	The user is seeking information about the innovation
(II)	Preparation	The user is preparing to use the innovation
(III)	Mechanical Use	The user is using the innovation in a poorly coordinated manner and is making user-oriented changes
(IVA)	Routine	The user is making few or no changes and has established patterns of use
(IVB)	Refinement	The user is making changes to increase outcomes
(V)	Integration	The user is making deliberate efforts to coordinate with others in using the innovation
(VI)	Renewal	The user is seeking more effective alternatives to the established use of the innovation

Hall et al., 1975*

*This publication (see Bibliography for complete citation) explains in detail how to use this tool and how to relate it to "Levels of Concern" (Figure 1).

"how-to-do-it" workshop, or to spend large amounts of time explaining the program's effects on children. In addition to helping the disseminator anticipate adoptors' questions, the ideas presented in Figures 1 and 2 are helpful for follow-up assistance, when it's not clear where people will be in the change process. For example, one year after training, some people will be at a mechanical level of use, some will be at a routine level, and still others will be refining the program. If the person providing follow-up assistance is sensitive to each user's level of concern and use, just the right type of assistance can be provided.

Simply reading more about the concepts and being sensitive to differences in people is one quick way to assess stages of concern and levels of use. More rigorous assessment can be made with paper and pencil (Newlove and Hall, 1976; Hall et al., 1977) and an interview procedure (Loucks et al., 1976). Model programs have found much success using these tools to guide assistance strategies.

The Practice Profile

In 1978, The NETWORK was funded by the U.S. Department of Education to investigate several federal dissemination strategies that supported school improvement through the implementation of new practices. Working with the Texas Research and Development Center at Austin, The NETWORK developed a tool called the "Practice Profile" (see Figure 3) to define practices selected for study.

The Practice Profile provides a picture of the model program. The disseminator can use this picture to effectively describe to potential adopters what the program looks like and how individuals behave when the program is in place. The profile also can be used as a yardstick to measure the progress of implementation.

The Practice Profile becomes a monitoring tool to answer questions such as: To what extent has the program been implemented? and How closely to its intended use is the program now used?

Practice Profiles differ from other tools in several ways. First, the profile standardizes the format in such a way that components are comparable across practices. This makes statistical analyses (necessary in research and evaluation) possible and enables individual projects to compare their practices with those of other programs; potential adopters can easily look across several projects. The NETWORK has also envisioned and is currently developing a "component bank" that will allow projects to describe themselves by borrowing rather than creating their own component descriptions. In addition to providing comparability, use of this component bank will be much less time-consuming than the independent composition of component descriptions. The bank will also allow potential adopters to access useful descriptions of various practices.

The development of Practice Profiles rests solely on the developer's perspective of the practice. Research (Huberman and Crandall, 1982; Hall and Loucks, 1978a) and experience tell us that school improvement efforts benefit from a clear, concise image of what a practice should look like: teachers and instructors want to know what's expected of them, and evaluators and researchers

PRACTICE PROFILE: A SAMPLE FROM THE ADULT BASIC SKILLS PROJECT (ABSP)

Part 1 - Component Checklist

Component	Ideal	Acceptable	Unacceptable
1 Diagnosis	Instructor diagnoses student reading and math levels using ABSP Competency Tests ☑	Instructor diagnoses student reading and math levels using procedure other than ABSP Competency Tests ☐	Instructor does not diagnose student reading and math levels ☐
2 Instructional Program	Instructor designs an individualized program for each student based on entry level skills ☑		Instructor does not design an individualized program for each student based on entry level skills ☐
3 Use of Materials	Instructor designs program for each student, using ABSP materials keyed to student level and enriched with wide variety of other materials ☐	Instructor designs program for each student utilizing only AJSP materials keyed to student level OR Instructor designs program for each student utilizing materials other than ABSP ☑	Instructor designs program for students without using materials ☐
4 Instructor Role	During student work time, instructor acts as facilitator, assists students individually when asked and convenes for direct instruction small groups of students with common skill needs ☑	During student work time, instructor acts as facilitator and assists students individually when asked, but never instructs students in groups ☐	During student work time, instructor usually leads groups or lectures to all students together OR During student work time, instructor is not available ☐

NOTE: Checkmarks indicate actual use of each component

(continued)

Figure 3 (continued)

PRACTICE PROFILE: A SAMPLE FROM THE ADULT BASIC SKILLS PROJECT (ABSP)

Part 2 - Implementation Requirements

1 Costs:

Start-up: $3,000 (program for 100 students)
Continuation (yearly): $50 per student
(NOTE: this is without adding staff)

2 Training:

Two weeks for staff before implementation
Two 2-day follow-up sessions over first year

3 Materials/Equipment:

ABSP Reading and Mathematics Curriculum Guides (one per student)

4 Personnel:

No additional staff required
Instructor needs usual skill in teaching adults, knowledge of basic reading and math skills

5 Organizational Arrangements:

A classroom where workspace and materials may be available to students at all times

Part 3 - Practice Characteristics

1 Purpose:

Basic skills development

2 Pedagogical Approach:

diagnostic/prescriptive

	low	(circle one)			high
3 Concreteness of Benefits:	1	2	(3)	4	5
comments					
4 Precision of Definition:	1	2	3	(4)	5
comments					
5 Prescriptiveness:	1	2	(3)	4	5
comments					
6 Complexity:	1	(2)	3	4	5
comments					

want to know what to look for. The developer's perspective provides a useful framework to clarify practice expectations and provides a standard to measure fidelity. Further, the Practice Profile format does not eliminate the possibility of describing user adaptations, thus providing a descriptive as well as an evaluative tool.

Finally, the Practice Profile is more than a checklist of components of the practice. It does include a component checklist, but it also provides a precise list of implementation requirements that show potential adopters what they must do before implementation and what support elements are needed. The Practice Profile also includes a system for assessing practice characteristics such as complexity, purpose, and prescriptiveness. Some characteristics have been shown (Rogers and Shoemaker, 1971) to make a difference in how and whether new practices get implemented. With the three kinds of information available from the Practice Profiles (component checklist, implementation requirements, and practice characteristics), consumers can make wise selections between programs. Practice Profiles offer a standard of comparison.

Component Checklist. Part 1 of the Practice Profile, the component checklist, identifies a manageable number (usually between six and twelve) of program features, each described behaviorally (i.e., role definitions are given). Variations are described according to ideal, acceptable, and unacceptable uses of each component. There can be any number of variations or no variations in each category. For example, in Figure 3 there is no "acceptable" variation of component 2; only the "ideal" use of the component is permissible. It is not necessary to list components in which any variation is acceptable, since they can be used in any way or not at all.

Component descriptions do not include requirements for implementation, such as training, facilities, personnel, or equipment. These are described in the next section of the Practice Profile. Rather, the component checklist describes the practice in use. Merely having had training, or having the right materials, personnel, or facilities, does not necessarily mean anything is actually being done -- that people are actually behaving in the defined ways.

Two kinds of checklists can be developed. The first, which The NETWORK has used most frequently and finds most valuable, is focused on the user. Definitions of behaviors state, for example, "The user tests ...," "The user groups students ...," etc. This kind of checklist can be used to monitor individual behaviors by completing one checklist for each user.

The second kind of checklist focuses on the practice as a whole and is most useful for complicated practices where people perform several roles. A practice focused on job training, for example, involves counselors, trainers, administrators, and teachers, each of whom behaves in different ways within the program. Here, while it is possible to create a user-focused checklist for each role, the large number of actual checklists would be cumbersome. Instead, one checklist can be constructed to combine all roles -- a practice-focused checklist. This type of checklist is particularly beneficial in describing a practice to new audiences. Figure 4 illustrates a simplified practice-focused checklist.

Figure 4

PRACTICE PROFILE: JOB SKILLS TRAINING (JST)

Part 1 - Component Checklist

Component	Ideal	Acceptable	Unacceptable
1 Diagnosis	During the first visit, a counselor interviews student for job goals and administers the JST Job Competency Test ☑	During the first visit, a counselor interviews student for job goals and administers a test of job skills other than the JST Job Competency Test ☐	During the first visit, a counselor does not interview student for job goals and/or does not administer a test of job skills ☐
2 Instructional Program	Instructor develops for student an individualized program based on job goals and entry level job competencies ☑	☐	Instructor develops for student an individualized program that ignores job goals and/or job competencies OR Instructor does not develop an individualized program for student ☐
3 Work Mode	Students come and go freely at Learning Center, working on the materials prescribed in their program at their own paces, assisted by monitor upon request ☐	Students come and go freely at Learning Center, working unassisted on the materials prescribed in their program at their own paces ☑	Students come to Learning Center at assigned times and work on their own program at a pace set by instructor ☐
4 Monitoring	Instructor and counselor both monitor student progress by meeting as a threesome once a week and formally testing progress in competency acquisition at least once a month ☐	Either instructor or counselor monitors student progress by meeting with student once a week and formally testing progress in competency acquisition at least once a month ☑	Student progress is not monitored at all, or is monitored through either meetings or periodic tests of competency acquisition but not through both ☐

Implementation Requirements and Practice Characteristics. The second and third parts of the Practice Profile are a listing of implementation requirements, which are self-explanatory, and an assessment of practice characteristics. Definitions and decision guidelines for assessing practice characteristics are not included here but are available in Loucks et al., 1982.

Collecting Data for Practice Profiles

Practice Profiles should be constructed by or with the developer of the practice. Information about components, implementation requirements, and practice characteristics comes from interviews with the developer, reading print materials, and observing the practices in use.

A component checklist may be completed for each individual user or, in the case of the practice-focused checklist, for the project as a whole or teams of users with different roles. Interviews with users are the most common way to collect data. Users are asked an open-ended question: describe your use of the practice. After the response, the interviewer probes any of the components that were not described. In some cases it is preferable to observe users to validly assess component use, especially when instructor-student interaction is involved (for example, when a certain ratio of instructor talk to student talk is required).

Using a Practice Profile in an HCEEP Program

Although the Practice Profile was originally developed to describe curriculum and instructional practices in the mainstream of education, the profile is equally applicable to model programs for handicapped children. "Users" can be teachers, health care professionals, or day care center personnel. Each has a role in making the program work, so behaviors of each can be described as components.

Use the Component Checklist for an early estimate of how much the adopting agency must change in order to accept your model. Some agencies will have many of your program's components already in place as they begin the process; others will need to start at or near the beginning. In the former case, where only minor adjustments are anticipated, a limited amount of assistance is needed. A good beginner's training session to bolster enthusiasm and develop commitment will suffice -- as long as the leader of the agency continues to support and make accommodations for continued use. An agency that must make major changes, however, can benefit from more specific, long-range assistance, with continued support from all kinds of staff members, local experts, and the leader as well. When prioritizing the sites with which you will spend your time, these "major changers" should be high on your list.

Practice Profiles help us understand and picture what people are doing with parts of a program, thereby aiding dissemination and monitoring efforts.

WHAT MUST THE ADOPTER DO?

Implementation of a model program at a new site can succeed only through a collaborative effort. All the appropriate assistance in the world will be useless without the commitment and attention of people at the adopting site. As Huberman and Crandall (1982) show, a constellation of players is needed to make a model program work.

In your role as disseminator you must educate individuals at adoption sites about their roles. This process involves more than training in the components and organizational requirements of your program; it includes understanding what factors lead to successful implementation and how to put those ingredients into place. This last section of the monograph discusses these ingredients and describes who might contribute most successfully to each (see Huberman and Crandall, 1982).

Develop a Vision

If you don't know where you're going, there's not much chance you'll get there. Applied to model program implementation, this axiom underlines the need for an adopting site to be clear about results they seek. What will various people be doing? How will the facilities look? What will the children be doing? Here, the Practice Profile comes in handy, particularly the Component Checklist.

The adopting agency need not adopt your "ideal" vision. Rather, working with site staff and with you, the adopting group's leader can describe the agency's unique vision. Your response may be to accommodate some of the constraints or peculiarities of the setting (e.g., different child needs, licensing requirements, funding considerations) by adding components to the model program. Using the Component Checklist as a starting point, work first with the adopting site to develop a vision.

The Leader

If your program requires significant change for agency staff, the leader of that agency (i.e., director, section chief, principal, manager) plays a critical role. This involvement, however, need not be directly related to the model program or practice. For example, if the model program involves an assessment battery to be used mainly by health care professionals, there is no reason why the agency head should provide direct assistance. Instead, the leader's most important contribution is to the agency's ongoing procedures and environment. Bauchner et al. (1982) show that as organizations become more stable, "crisis-management" orientation lessens, and the potential for lasting, agency-wide changes increases. Here, the leader of the adopting site is the key. Has she or he established procedures for making and carrying out plans and solving problems as they arise? These are important areas for a leader's attention; without stability and a systematic orientation, any new program will be short-lived.

Commit

As noted earlier, it is important to have an image of what the program will look like after it's in place. This image is part of a commitment made by a leader or leaders: this program will be implemented. The decision to adopt may be made collaboratively or by the leadership only, but the important thing is that the commitment be public and unequivocal. This action doesn't necessarily require strong-arming (though it sometimes may, if all else fails); active enthusiasm may suffice. A statement of commitment may be soft: "This program has had excellent results elsewhere and we've decided to try it here." The key is that the staff must realize that they will be involved in using the program.

Unless assistance immediately follows a decision to commit to a model, "lip-service compliance" usually results; nothing really changes. So it is essential that the adopting agency's leader provide his or her staff with help and encouragement. Plenty of initial and continual help is essential until the model program truly is a way of life at the adopting site. This assistance is not restricted to individuals; it must also involve the establishment of procedures that will "stick" when attention to the program lessens. The adopter must automatically train new staff, routinely order necessary materials and equipment, and provide a budget line item to support the program. Without these procedures, well-implemented and beneficial programs can be lost, often without a trace.

A mandate, followed by assistance, requires another ingredient -- continued encouragement and intangible support. This might be termed "pressure," but not in the more common, negative sense. Effective leaders are visibly supportive of new programs, offer personal encouragement, and are available to talk about and act immediately on problems that arise. These people make it clear that the program is a priority. They take their monitoring job seriously. This kind of pressure must start early and stay late.

Limit Adaptation

Berman and McLaughlin (1975) and Hall and Loucks (1978a) document a propensity for adopters to adapt, change, modify, even mutate a program before or during implementation. Often what results hardly resembles the original program. If the disseminator believes the model program or practice works the way it was developed, and if the adopting site is not altogether unlike the disseminator's site, the adopting agency's leaders should allow his or her staff only a limited amount of latitude to change the program. Here again, the disseminator can help. With the Practice Profile, point out the components you believe are essential and should be used "as is." Designate other components where users have choices -- being allowed to adapt a program to one's own situation contributes to ownership, which is important to success. However, ownership is useless if the critical parts of a program have been changed beyond recognition. Setting clear expectations at this stage will further the potential for success.

CLOSING

Dissemination is an essential task of a model program. And, to succeed, dissemination efforts require time, attention, planning, and action throughout the life of the model project. Furthermore, dissemination is a highly complex process that takes more than fancy brochures and awareness presentations. Rather, to ensure that a model program is used appropriately and successfully in another site, assistance to that site must be substantial and ongoing and must include a strong component to educate leaders at the site about key ingredients for success. The best of intentions; the most collegial, participatory implementation process; or the greatest program ever created cannot alone ensure implementation success. An array of elements must be built in and carefully integrated to significantly raise the potential for success.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Bauchner, J., Cox, P., and Schmidt, W. Policies, people, and practices: Examining the chain of school improvement. Vol. III. Models of change. Andover, MA: The NETWORK, Inc., 1982.

Bentzen, M. et al. Changes schools: The magic feather principle. New York: McGraw Hill, 1974.

Berman, P., McLaughlin, M., et al. Federal programs supporting educational change (eight volumes). Santa Monica, CA: Rand Corporation, 1975 (volumes 1-5); 1977 (volumes 6-8).

Emrick, J., with Peterson, S., and Agarwala-Rogers, R. Evaluation of the National Diffusion Network (two volumes). Menlo Park, CA: Stanford Research Institute, 1977.

Hall, G., and Loucks, S. Innovation configurations: Analyzing the adaptation of innovations. Austin, TX: Research and Development Center for Teacher Education, University of Texas, 1978a.

Hall, G.E., and Loucks, S.F. Teacher concerns as the basis for facilitating and personalizing staff development. Teachers College Record 80(1), 1978b, pp. 36-53.

Hall, G., George, A., and Rutherford, W. Measuring stages of concern about the innovation: A manual for use of the stages of concern questionnaire. Austin, TX: Research and Development Center for Teacher Education, University of Texas, 1977.

Hall, G., Loucks, S., Rutherford, W., and Newlove, B. Levels of use of the innovation: A framework for analyzing innovation adoption. The Journal of Teacher Education 29(1), 1975, pp. 52-56.

Huberman, A.M., and Crandall, D.P. Policies, people, and practices: Examining the chain of school improvement. Vol. IX. Implications for action. Andover, MA: The NETWORK, Inc., 1982.

Loucks, S.F., and Crandall, D.P. The practice profile: An all purpose tool for program communication, staff development, evaluation, and improvement. Andover, MA: The NETWORK, Inc., 1982.

Loucks, S., Cox, P., Huberman, A.M., Miles, M., and Eiseman, J. Policies, people, and practices: Examining the chain of school improvement. Vol. II. Portraits of the changes, the players, and the context. Andover, MA: The NETWORK, Inc., 1982.

Loucks, S., and Hall, G. Implementing innovation in schools: A concerns based approach. Austin, Texas: Research and Development Center for Teacher Education, University of Texas, 1979.

Loucks, S.F., Newlove, B.W., and Hall, G.E. Measuring levels of use of the innovation: A manual for trainers, interviewers and raters. Austin, TX: Research and Development Center for Teacher Education, University of Texas, 1976.

Louis, K., Rosenblum, S., et al. Linking r&d with schools (four volumes). Cambridge, MA: Abt Associates, 1981.

The NETWORK, Inc. Policies, people, and practices: Examining the chain of school improvement. Vol. I-X. Andover, MA: 1982.

Newlove, B.W., and Hall, G.E. A manual for assessing open-ended statements of concern about an innovation. Austin, TX: Research and Development Center for Teacher Education, University of Texas, 1976.

Research and Development Center for Teacher Education. Assessing program adaptation during implementation: Concepts, strategies and issues. Austin, TX: 1981.

Rogers, E.M., and Schoemaker, F.F., Communication of innovation. New York: Free Press, 1971.

Sterns, M., and Norwood, C. Evaluation of the field test of project information packages (two volumes). Menlo Park, CA: Stanford Research Institute, 1977.